

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	_	
	09/898,385	07/05/2001	David Paul Jones	ESM00-003 3631			
	7590 08/23/2004 Samuel H. Weiner, Esq. OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN,LLP 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICANS			EXAMINER			
				RUDE, TIMOTHY L			
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	NEW YORK		·	2002		_	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			an
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/898,385	JONES ET AL.	
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Timothy L Rude	2883	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	lress
THE REPLY FILED 09 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli (1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper re ich places the appli	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR F	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 4_months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorter (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of th ned statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellar 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR)			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:		
(a)   they raise new issues that would require fur	ther consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	e below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cand NOTE:	celing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej	ection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ald be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely file	d amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does N	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered to raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	pecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	/s:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3,24 and 26-32</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ a	pproved or b)□ disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Staten	nent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	_ <del>_</del>	•
200 20000000000000000000000000000000000			
		tir	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues alternate definitions for terms. Examiner must give said terms the most broad reasonable interpretation given ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals. Specifically, examiner considers "black matrix" to be virtually synonymous to "light blocking layer". For convenience, Applicant may reference Fujikawa USPAT 6,002,463 where those terms are equivocated. Also, Applicant may reference text book HANDBOOK OF DISPLAY TECHNOLOGY by Joseph A. Castellano, C 1962 by Academic Press, Inc., ISBN 0-12-163420-5, page 299, last paragraph through page 300, first paragraph. Examienr maintains the light bocking layer of the applied prior art is considered by those of ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals to read on and function as Applicant's black matrix as presently broadly claimed and broadly interpreted. Examiner maintains final rejection of present claim language is proper.

Continuation of 10. Other: Copy of pages 299 and 300 of HANDBOOK OF DISPLAY TECHNOLOGY is attached..

Frank G. Font Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 2800

Frank & Fort